

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/667,731	BACKUS, PHILIP C.	
	Examiner Justin M. Larson	Art Unit 3782	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Justin M. Larson. (3) _____.

(2) Robert L. Farris. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 January 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner contacted Mr. Farris, inquiring as to whether or not a response to the Notice of Non-Compliance mailed 7/19/06 had been filed, or if the case had been abandoned. Mr. Farris asserted that a sufficient response had been filed. Due to unknown circumstance, this response was never received by the USPTO for entry to the record. Because the six month time period for reply is over, Examiner informed Mr. Farris that the case is effectively abandoned and that a petition should be prepared in attempt to revive the application.